When better seems bigger: ESM 2

Study 1 – Results for participant height, weight, and sex effects

Study 1 height in centimeters

Participant height (*p* = .832; bootstrap: *p* = .679), participant sex (*p* = .938; bootstrap: *p* = .872), and estimated performance (*p* = .462; bootstrap: *p* = .463) all did not have a significant effect on height estimation in centimeters.

Study 1 continuous height

Participant sex (*p* = .927; bootstrap: *p* = .874) did not have a significant effect on continuous height estimation. Participant height (*t*(273.348) = -2.463, *p* = .014, 95% CI [-2.34, -.26]; bootstrap: *p* = .002, 95% CI [-2.01, -.61]) and estimated performance (*t*(1138.551) = 1.996, *p* = .046, 95% CI [.00, .09]; bootstrap: *p* = .178, 95% CI [.02, .03]) did have a significant effect on continuous height estimation. Shorter individuals estimated the players to be taller, and when players were estimated to perform better, they were also estimated to be taller.

Study 1 weight in kilograms

Participant sex (*p* = .511; bootstrap: *p* = .184) and estimated performance (*p* = .447; bootstrap: *p* = .454) did not have a significant effect on weight estimation in kilograms. Participant weight (*t*(284.677) = -1.891 , *p* = .06, 95% CI [-.90, .02]; bootstrap: *p* = .001, 95% CI [-.69, -.17]) had a marginally significant effect on weight estimation in kilograms, which was significant after bootstrapping. Less heavy individuals estimated the players to be heavier.

Study 1 continuous weight

Participant weight (*p* = .526; bootstrap: *p* = .158) and sex (*p* = .207) did not have a significant effect on continuous weight estimation. However, after bootstrapping, sex did have a significant effect on continuous weight estimation: $p = .004$, 95% CI [.48, 3.44].

Previous findings that men significantly overestimate height more than women do were not supported. The argument that men use their own (taller) height or weight as an anchor is not supported by these results.

Study 1 - Individual player effects

Height estimations in cm

To examine possible player effects, we ran the second model again for each player individually. The results of the individual models were similar to the general model: participant height, participant gender, and estimated performance all did not have a significant effect on height estimation in centimeters (all *p*'s > .05). There was one exception: for Sneijder, there was a significant effect of participant gender on estimated height in centimeters ($t(285) = -2.018$, $p = .045$, 95% CI [-2.97, .04]; bootstrap: $p = .019$, 95% CI [.00, .04])). Women ($M = 1.307$, $SD = 3.62$) estimated Sneijder as taller than men ($M = -.204$, $SD = 4.39$) did. We conclude that the general model can be maintained, as the majority of the individual player effects corresponds with the overall effects.

Continuous height estimations

To examine possible player effects, we ran the second model again for each player individually. Again, the results of the individual models were largely similar to the general model, however with some more individual deviations. For Robben, both participant height ($p = .026$) and estimated performance ($p = .003$) had a significant effect on continuous height estimation. However for Sneijder, there was only a significant effect of participant height ($p = .009$), but not of estimated performance ($p = .666$) on continuous height estimation. Finally, for van Persie and van Bommel, there was only a significant effect of estimated performance ($p < .001$; $p = .002$), but not of participant height ($p = .239$; $p = .397$) on continuous height estimation. We conclude that the general model can be maintained, as the majority of the individual effects correspond with the overall effects. Furthermore, all individual effects were generally in the same direction.

Weight estimations in kg

To examine possible player effects, we ran the second model again for each player individually. For all of the individual models, participant gender and estimated performance did not have a significant effect on weight estimation in kilograms (all *p*'s > .05). However, only for Robben did participant weight have a significant effect on estimated weight in kilograms ($t(284) = -2.761$, $p = .006$, 95% CI [-1.57, -.26]; van Persie: $p = .813$; Sneijder: $p = .151$; van Bommel $p = .381$). We therefore conclude that the marginal effect of participant weight found in the general model was due to Robben, and that this effect cannot be generalized to the other players.

Continuous weight estimations

To examine possible player effects, we ran the second model again for each player individually. The results of the individual models were similar to the general model: estimated performance had a significant effect on weight estimation via sliders (Robben: $p = .007$; van Persie: $p < .001$; Sneijder: $p = .035$). There was one exception: for van Bommel, there was no significant effect of estimated performance on estimated weight via sliders ($p = .523$). Furthermore, only for van Persie, there was a significant effect of participant gender on estimated weight via sliders ($t(284) = 2.412$, $p = .016$, 95% CI [.94, 9.30]). Men ($M = .594$, $SD = 12.12$) estimated van Persie as heavier than women ($M = -3.807$, $SD = 13.91$) did. We conclude that the general model can be maintained, as the majority of the individual effects correspond with the overall effects.

Tables with results Study 1

ESM Table 1

Linear mixed models with estimated height in centimeters Study 1

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
Parameter	***b***	***SE***	**95% CI**	***b***	***SE***	**95% CI**	***b***	***SE***	**95% CI**
Intercept	-.04	.37	-.78, .69	-.04	.54	-1.10, 1.03	-.04	.54	-1.10, 1.03
Pp height	-.05	.14	-.32, .22	-.01	.20	-.43, .35	-.04	.20	-.43, .35
Pp sex	.06	.40	-.74, .85	.05	.58	-1.10, 1.19	.05	.58	-1.10, 1.19
Estimated performance	-.00	.01	-.02, .01	-.01	.01	-.02, .01	-.01	.01	-.02, .01

Models: (1) fixed main effects only; (2) fixed main effects and random intercept; (3) random slopes and random intercept

**p<.05, **p<.01*

ESM Table 2

Linear mixed models with estimated height in sliders Study 1

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
Parameter	***b***	***SE***	**95% CI**	***b***	***SE***	**95% CI**	***b***	***SE***	**95% CI**
Intercept	-.30	1.04	-.2.34, 1.74	-.12	1.44	-.2.95, 2.71	-.10	1.44	-.2.93,2.73
Pp height	-1.37**	.38	-2.12, -.62	-1.30*	.53	-2.34, -.26	-1.29*	.53	-2.33, -.24
Pp sex	.34	1.12	-1.85, 2.54	.14	1.55	-2.90, 3.19	.10	1.55	-2.95, 3.14
Estimated performance	.11**	.02	.07, .16	.04*	.02	.00, .09	.04	.02	-.00, .09

Models: (1) fixed main effects only; (2) fixed main effects and random intercept; (3) random slopes and random intercept

*p<.05, **p<.01

ESM Table 3

Linear mixed models with estimated weight in kilograms Study 1

	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3		
Parameter	***b***	***SE***	**95% CI**	***b***	***SE***	**95% CI**	***b***	***SE***	**95% CI**
Intercept	.39	.43	-.45, 1.22	.37	.64	-.88, 1.63	.37	.64	-.88, 1.63
Pp weight	-.44**	.16	-.74, -.13	-.44	.23	-.90, -.02	-.44	.23	-.90, -.02
Pp sex	-.47	.46	-1.37, .43	-.45	.69	-1.80, .90	-.45	.69	-1.80, .90
Estimated performance	-.00	.01	-.02, .02	.01	.01	-.01, .02	.01	.01	-.01, .02

Models: (1) fixed main effects only; (2) fixed main effects and random intercept; (3) random slopes and random intercept

*p<.05, **p<.01

ESM Table 4

Linear mixed models with estimated weight in sliders Study 1

	Model 1			**Model 2**			**Model 3**		
Parameter	***b***	***SE***	**95% CI**	***b***	***SE***	**95% CI**	***b***	***SE***	**95% CI**
Intercept	-1.91	1.01	-3.89, .072	-1.77	1.51	-4.74, 1.19	-1.79	1.50	-4.75, 1.17
Pp weight	-.36	.37	-1.08, .36	-.35	.55	-1.43, .73	-.32	.55	-1.39, .76
Pp sex	2.20*	1.08	.08, 4.33	2.05	1.62	-1.14, 5.24	2.05	1.61	-1.12, 5.22
Estimated performance	.10**	.02	.06, .14	.04*	.02	.01, .08	.04*	.02	.00, .09

Models: (1) fixed main effects only; (2) fixed main effects and random intercept; (3) random slopes and random intercept

*p<.05, **p<.01